arXiv:1402.7222v1 [quant-ph] 28 Feb 2014

Mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in coupled optomechanical systems

Xun-Wei Xu,[1] Yu-xi Liu,[2,3] Chang-Pu Sun,[1] and Yong Li[1,*]

[1]*Beijing Computational Science Research Center, Beijing 100084, China*
[2]*Institute of Microelectronics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*
[3]*Tsinghua National Laboratory for Information Science and Technology (TNList), Beijing 100084, China*

(Dated: March 3, 2014)

We propose to observe mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in the coupled optomechanical systems. In order to provide gain to one mechanical resonator and equivalent amount of damp to another, we drive the two optical cavities with a blue and a red detuned laser fields respectively. After adiabatically eliminating the freedom of the cavity modes, we develop a formalism for describing mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric system. Moreover, we discuss the experimental feasibility of our scheme and show that the observation of mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric transition in the coupled optomechanical systems is within the reach of resent experiments.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Wk, 07.10.Cm, 11.30.Er

I. INTRODUCTION

In the standard quantum mechanics, in order to guarantee real energy spectrum and unitary time evolution, the Hamiltonian H of the system is required to be Hermitian. Several years ago, Bender *et al.* extended the standard quantum mechanics to the complex plane, then a complex quantum mechanics is builded with the axiom of Hermiticity replacing by the condition of space-time reflection ($\mathcal{PT}$) symmetry [1, 2]. As the $\mathcal{PT}$ operator is anti-linear, the eigenstates of H may or may not be eigenstates of $\mathcal{PT}$ operator, despite the fact that H and the $\mathcal{PT}$ operator commute [3]. It has been demonstrated that a threshold exists in the system, below which both H and the $\mathcal{PT}$ operators share the same set of eigenvectors and the spectrum is completely real; above which the eigenfunctions of H cease to be eigenfunctions of the $\mathcal{PT}$ operator, and the spectrum is no longer completely real and instead becomes complex. This threshold marks the boundary between the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and broken-symmetry phases. In the complex quantum mechanics, if the Hamiltonian H has an unbroken $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry, then the spectrum is real and system have positive probabilities and unitary time evolution by constructing a new type of inner product [2]. Non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians play a significant role in complex quantum mechanics and quantum field theory (see, review [4]).

Although the complex quantum mechanics based upon non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetry is still debated, several experimental systems are proposed to test the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in non-Hermitian systems. Optical systems with complex refractive indices provide an appropriate platform for the observation of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry [5–7], and the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry has been observed in several optical systems in the past few years, including two coupled waveguides [8], photonic lattices [9, 10], and microwave billiard [11]. Some interesting features such as non-reciprocal light propagation [8, 12], double refraction [6], absorption-enhanced transmission [13], and unidirectional invisibility [10, 14], are observed in the experiments. In addition, $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry also has been realized in the active *LRC* circuits [15, 16]. Recently, Bender *et al.* observed the $\mathcal{PT}$ phase transition in a simple mechanical systems [17].

Optomechanical systems, in which mechanical resonators coupled to electromagnetic fields via radiation pressure or optical gradient force, have drawn much attention in the past decade for nonclassical states manipulation and their potential applications in quantum information processing (see, reviews [18–20]). It has been theoretically studied and experimentally demonstrated that the motion of mechanical resonators in the optomichanical systems can be controlled by driven the optical cavity with a laser field. If the frequency of the laser field becomes lower than the cavity's resonant frequency, the motion of mechanical resonators can be suppressed and cooled down [21–38]. On the contrary, if the laser field is tuned above resonance, the motion of mechanical resonators will be enhanced and heated [39–57]. This control mechanism offers us a potential avenue to investigate mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in the coupled optomechanical systems.

In this paper, we propose to realize mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in the coupled optomechanical systems. Different with the simple mechanical systems [17], the gain or damp of the mechanical resonators are controlled by driving the cavity with detuned laser fields. More important, this system is working in the micrometer scale, and our study may pave the way towards a class of mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems in the quantum regime [58].

The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, the Hamiltonian of the coupled optomechanical systems is introduced and the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric equations for the mechanical modes are derived. The mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric phase transition is shown in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we discuss the experimental feasibility of our proposal and finally draw our conclusions.

II. MODEL AND $\mathcal{PT}$-SYMMETRIC EQUATIONS

As shown in Fig. 1, the coupled optomechanical systems consist of two optomechanical systems coupled through a harmonic force between the two movable mirrors [59]. The

*Electronic address: liyong@csrc.ac.cn



FIG. 1: (Color online) Schematic diagram of an coupled optomechanical system with the cavities driven by detuned laser fields. Here, the two movable mirrors are coupled via a harmonic force.

Hamiltonian for the coupled systems is given by ($\hbar = 1$)

$$H = H_o + H_m + H_{om}, \tag{1}$$

where

$$H_o = \sum_{i=1,2}\left[\Delta_i a_i^\dagger a_i + \left(\Omega_i a_i^\dagger + \text{H.c.}\right)\right], \tag{2}$$

$$H_m = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1,2}\left[\omega_i\left(q_i^2 + p_i^2\right)\right] - Jq_1q_2, \tag{3}$$

$$H_{om} = -g_1 a_1^\dagger a_1 q_1 - g_2 a_2^\dagger a_2 q_2. \tag{4}$$

H_o describes the two single-mode cavities (a_i, $i = 1, 2$) driven by an external field with Rabi frequency Ω_i respectively, and $\Delta_i = \omega_i^c - \omega_d$ is the frequency detuning between the cavity mode (ω_i^c) and external driven field (ω_d). The two movable mirrors (q_i and p_i, the dimensionless position and momentum operators for the movable mirrors) act as two mechanical resonators with mechanical frequency ω_i, and H_m describes the linear coupled mechanical resonators with coupling strength J much smaller than the mechanical frequency ($\omega_i \gg J$). The optomechanical interaction caused by the radiation pressure is given in the term H_{om} with coupling constant g_i.

The dynamics of the cavity fields and mechanical oscillators can be described by quantum Langevin equations. After considering the dissipation but neglecting fluctuation of the cavity fields and mechanical resonators, we can get the dynamic equations as follows:

$$\frac{d}{dt}a_1 = -\left[\frac{\kappa_1}{2} + i\left(\Delta_1 - g_1 q_1\right)\right]a_1 - i\Omega_1, \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}a_2 = -\left[\frac{\kappa_2}{2} + i\left(\Delta_2 - g_2 q_2\right)\right]a_2 - i\Omega_2, \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}q_1 = \omega_1 p_1, \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}q_2 = \omega_2 p_2, \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_1 = -\omega_1 q_1 + Jq_2 + g_1 a_1^\dagger a_1 - \frac{\gamma_1}{2}p_1, \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_2 = -\omega_2 q_2 + Jq_1 + g_2 a_2^\dagger a_2 - \frac{\gamma_2}{2}p_2. \tag{10}$$

Here, κ_i is cavity decay rate and γ_i is the mechanical damping rate of the movable mirror. In order to solve the nonlinear dynamic equations, we can write the operators as the sum of the steady value and the time dependent terms: $a_i \to \alpha_i + a_i$ and $q_i \to \xi_i + q_i$, where α_i and ξ_i are the steady values of the system and satisfy the following equations:

$$\left[\frac{\kappa_1}{2} + i\left(\Delta_1 - g_1\xi_1\right)\right]\alpha_1 = -i\Omega_1, \tag{11}$$

$$\left[\frac{\kappa_2}{2} + i\left(\Delta_2 - g_2\xi_2\right)\right]\alpha_2 = -i\Omega_2, \tag{12}$$

$$\omega_1\xi_1 - J\xi_2 = g_1\left|\alpha_1\right|^2, \tag{13}$$

$$\omega_2\xi_2 - J\xi_1 = g_2\left|\alpha_2\right|^2. \tag{14}$$

In the strong external driven condition $\Omega_i \gg \kappa_i$, we assume that $|\alpha_i| \gg |a_i|$. After neglecting the nonlinear terms (e.g. $g_i a_i^\dagger a_i$), the dynamic equations for the time dependent terms are given as

$$\frac{d}{dt}a_1 = -\left(\frac{\kappa_1}{2} + i\Delta_1'\right)a_1 + iG_1 q_1, \tag{15}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}a_2 = -\left(\frac{\kappa_2}{2} + i\Delta_2'\right)a_2 + iG_2 q_2, \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}q_1 = \omega_1 p_1, \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}q_2 = \omega_2 p_2, \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_1 = -\omega_1 q_1 + Jq_2 + G_1^* a_1 + G_1 a_1^\dagger - \frac{\gamma_1}{2}p_1, \tag{19}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_2 = -\omega_2 q_2 + Jq_1 + G_2^* a_2 + G_2 a_2^\dagger - \frac{\gamma_2}{2}p_2, \tag{20}$$

where $\Delta_i' = \Delta_i - g_i\xi_i$, $G_i = g_i\alpha_i$ is the effective optomechanical coupling constant.

From Eqs. (15)-(20), we can derive the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetric dynamic equations for the coupled mechanical resonators. Under the assumption that the cavities dynamic much faster than the effective optomechanical coupling $\kappa_i \gg G_i$, we can adiabatically eliminate the cavity modes [60] (for details see Appendix A), then we find

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_1 = -\left(\omega_1 + \delta\omega_1\right)q_1 + Jq_2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma_1 - \gamma_1\right)p_1, \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_2 = -\left(\omega_2 - \delta\omega_2\right)q_2 + Jq_1 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma_2 + \gamma_2\right)p_2, \tag{22}$$

where

$$\delta\omega_i = \frac{8\left|G_i\right|^2\omega_i}{\kappa_i^2 + 16\omega_i^2}, \tag{23}$$

$$\Gamma_i = \frac{4\left|G_i\right|^2}{\kappa_i}\frac{16\omega_i^2}{\kappa_i^2 + 16\omega_i^2}, \tag{24}$$

are the radiation pressure induced frequency shift and gain (damp) [24, 25]. In the resolved-sideband regime $\omega_i \gg \kappa_i$ and the adiabatic elimination conditions $\kappa_i \gg G_i$, the frequency shift induced by radiation pressure is very small ($\delta\omega_i \ll \omega_i$). If the external driven field are strongly enough,

then the original mechanical damping rates will be much smaller than the radiation pressure induced gain (damp) $\gamma_i \ll \Gamma_i$. After neglecting the frequency shift $\delta\omega_i$ and the original mechanical damp γ_i, with $\mathcal{PT}$ requirements: $\gamma_{\rm eff} = \Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$ and $\omega_m = \omega_1 = \omega_2$, the dynamic equations for the coupled mechanical resonators are given as

$$\frac{d}{dt}q_1 = \omega_m p_1, \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}q_2 = \omega_m p_2, \tag{26}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_1 = -\omega_m q_1 + J q_2 + \frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}}{2} p_1, \tag{27}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}p_2 = -\omega_m q_2 + J q_1 - \frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}}{2} p_2. \tag{28}$$

Combining Eqs. (25) and (27); (26) and (28), we obtain

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}q_1 - \frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}}{2}\frac{d}{dt}q_1 = -\omega_m^2 q_1 + \omega_m J q_2, \tag{29}$$

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}q_2 + \frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}}{2}\frac{d}{dt}q_2 = -\omega_m^2 q_2 + \omega_m J q_1. \tag{30}$$

It is easy to check that the dynamic equations (Eqs. (25)-(28) or Eqs. (29)-(30)) are invariant under the $\mathcal{PT}$ transformation (i.e. $\mathcal{P}$: the subscripts $1 \leftrightarrow 2$; $\mathcal{T}$: $t \to -t$).

Now, let us derive the threshold marking the boundary between the broken and unbroken $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regimes. Eqs. (25)-(28) can be rewrite in a compacted matrix form as

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\left|\Psi\right\rangle = H_{\rm eff}\left|\Psi\right\rangle, \tag{31}$$

where $\left|\Psi\right\rangle = (q_1, p_1, q_2, p_2)^T$, and

$$H_{\rm eff} = i\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega_m & 0 & 0 \\ -\omega_m & \frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}}{2} & J & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_m \\ J & 0 & -\omega_m & -\frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{32}$$

The eigenvalues of $H_{\rm eff}$ are given as

$$\lambda_{1,2,3,4} = \pm\lambda_{\pm}, \tag{33}$$

where

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \sqrt{\omega_m^2 - \frac{\gamma_{\rm eff}^2 \pm \sqrt{\gamma_{\rm eff}^4 - 16\omega_m^2(\gamma_{\rm eff}^2 - 4J^2)}}{8}}. \tag{34}$$

As $\omega_m \gg J \sim \gamma_{\rm eff}$, in order to ensure that all the eigenvalues of $H_{\rm eff}$ are real, the effective damping rate $\gamma_{\rm eff}$ need to satisfy

$$\gamma_{\rm eff}^4 - 16\omega_m^2\gamma_{\rm eff}^2 + 64\omega_m^2 J^2 \geq 0. \tag{35}$$

This condition gives the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime

$$0 \leq \gamma_{\rm eff} \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{PT}}, \tag{36}$$

with the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric threshold

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{PT}} = 2\sqrt{2}\omega_m\sqrt{1 - \sqrt{1 - (J/\omega_m)^2}} \approx 2J. \tag{37}$$

Eqs. (31) can be solved analytically by the bi-orthogonal basis approach [61–63] (for details see Appendix B). In the following, we are interested in dynamics of the mean value of the system, so treat the operators as c-numbers in the semi-classical approximation.



FIG. 2: (Color online) The dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors for $J = 0$: (a) left mirror q_1 (red curve) and (b) right mirror q_2 (green curve). The parameters used in numerical calculation are $\omega_m = 10\kappa$, $\Omega = 50\kappa$ and $g = \kappa/100$.

III. MECHANICAL $\mathcal{PT}$-SYMMETRIC PHASE TRANSITION

In this section, we will show the dynamic behaviour of the two mechanical resonators in the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and broken-symmetry regimes. Without loss of generality, we assume that $g_1 = g_2 = g$, $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = \kappa$, $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \Omega$ and normalize all parameters to κ. The parameters in the following numerical calculations are: $\omega_m = 10\kappa$, $g = \kappa/100$, $\Omega = 50\kappa$, $\Delta_1' = -\omega_m$ and $\Delta_2' = \omega_m$. By solving the Eqs. (11)-(14), we find that: $\Delta_i' \approx \Delta_i$, $G_i \approx \kappa/20$, $\Gamma_i \approx \kappa/100$, $\delta\omega_i \approx \kappa/8000$. If the quality factor of the mechanical resonators are high (e.g. $Q_m \sim 10^5$) so that $\gamma_i \ll \Gamma_i$, then we can ignore the original mechanical damp in the time scale that $t \ll 1/\gamma_i$.

First of all, we give the dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors in Fig. 2 by solving Eqs. (5)-(10) numerically in the case that the two mirrors are uncoupled to each other ($J = 0$) with initial conditions: $q_1 = p_1 = q_2 = p_2 = 0$. In Fig. 2(b), as the right cavity (noted by 2) is driven by a laser resonant to the red sideband, the oscillation amplitude of the right mirror decreases exponentially with rate $\gamma_{\rm eff} \approx \kappa/100$. On the contrary, the left cavity (noted by 1) is driven by a laser resonant to the blue sideband, then the oscillation amplitude of the left mirror increases exponentially with rate $\gamma_{\rm eff} \approx \kappa/100$ until the gain saturate as shown in Fig. 2(a). There are nonlinear terms in the dynamic equations (Eqs. (5)-(10)) that cause the saturation behaviours, and these terms become important as the increase of the oscillation amplitude of the mirror. The saturation behaviours have already been predicted theoretically [42–50] and observed experimentally [51–57].

As adiabatic approximation we have used in the derivation, we expect that the mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and broken-symmetric phases can be observed during the time interval $1/\kappa \ll t \ll 1/\gamma_i$. Before arriving this regime, there is a transient process for the mechanical resonators as shown in Fig. 3, which are given by numerically solving Eqs. (5)-(10) with initial conditions: $q_1 = p_1 = q_2 = p_2 = 0$. It is clear that time of duration for the transient process is about the lift time of the cavity (e.g. $t = 2\pi/\kappa$), and the oscillation amplitudes of the mechanical resonators are about 0.5. In order to make the comparison of the results given by Eqs. (5)-(10) and by Eqs. (25)-(28) more convenient, we will solve Eqs. (5)-(10) with initial conditions: $q_1 = p_1 = q_2 = p_2 = 0$ and solve Eqs. (25)-(28) (or Eqs. (17)-(18) and (21)-(22)) with initial



FIG. 3: (Color online) The dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors q_1 (red curve) and q_2 (green curve) given by Eqs. (5)-(10) for $J = \gamma_{\rm eff}$. The other parameters used in numerical calculation are the same as given in Fig. 2.



FIG. 5: (Color online) The dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors q_1 (red curve) and q_2 (green curve) given by Eqs. (17)-(18) and (21)-(22) with $\gamma_{\rm eff} = \Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$, $\omega_m = \omega_1 = \omega_2$, $\delta\omega_i = \kappa/8000$, and $J = 0.55\gamma_{\rm eff}$. The other parameters are the same as given in Fig. 2.



FIG. 4: (Color online) The dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors q_1 (red curve) and q_2 (green curve). (a, c, e) are given by Eqs. (5)-(10) and (b, d, f) are given by Eqs. (25)-(28) for: (a, b) $J = \gamma_{\rm eff}$; (c, d) $J = 0.55\gamma_{\rm eff}$; (c, d) $J = 0.2\gamma_{\rm eff}$. The other parameters are the same as given in Fig. 2.

conditions: $q_1 = q_2 = 0.5$ and $p_1 = p_2 = 0$ in the following.

Now let us investigate the dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors for the parameters in the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and broken-symmetry regime as shown in Fig. 4, where (a, c, e) are given by Eqs. (5)-(10) and (b, d, f) are given by Eqs. (25)-(28). In Fig. 4(a, b), as $\gamma_{\rm eff} < 2J$, the system is in the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime. The two mirrors become two beat frequency oscillators with the beat frequency related to the differences of λ_+ and λ_- as shown in Eq. (34), and they are a litter out of phase with each other. In Fig. 4(c, d), as $\gamma_{\rm eff} \approx 2J$, the system is near the critical point for phase transition (still in the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime), the oscillation amplitudes increase but the beat frequency becomes lower. In Fig. 4(e, f), as $\gamma_{\rm eff} > 2J$, the system is in the broken $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime. The oscillation amplitude of the left mirror increases exponentially, and the oscillation amplitude of the right mirror also increases after an initial decreases.

As time goes on, the difference between Fig. 3(a, c, e) and (b, d, f) becomes more significant. The differences mainly come from the frequency shift induced by radiation pressure $\delta\omega_i$. In other words, the litter frequency shift will destroy the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry of the system. As we have mentioned that with the parameters in numerical calculation, the frequency shift $\delta\omega_i$ is about $\kappa/8000$. In Fig. 5, we show the dynamic behaviour of the two mirrors by numerical solving Eqs. (17)-(18) and (21)-(22) by setting $\gamma_{\rm eff} = \Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$, $\omega_m = \omega_1 = \omega_2$ and $\delta\omega_i = \kappa/8000$. The results are agree well with the figures given by Eqs. (5)-(10) as shown in Fig. 4(c).

IV. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Let us now discuss the experimental feasibility for the observation of mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric transition in the coupled optomechanical system. In the calculation, we have assume that the parameters satisfy the following conditions: (i) the resolved-sideband condition, $\omega_m = 10\kappa$; (ii) weak optomechanical coupling, $g = \kappa/100$, $G_i = \kappa/20$; (iii) strong driven condition, $\Omega = 50\kappa$; (iv) resonant condition, $\Delta_1 = -\omega_m$, $\Delta_2 = \omega_m$; (v) hight mechanical quality factor, $\gamma_i \ll \Gamma_i$. Most of the parameters in the calculation are within the reach of the current technology. For example, the sideband cooling has been observed in many different types of optomechanical systems [28–35]; the optomechanical coupling constant has reach the level of $g = 10^{-2}\kappa$ and coherent

mixing of mechanical excitations have been observed in the zipper cavity and double-disk cavity [64–67].

As the cavity fields decay much faster then the optomechanical coupling, the cavity field evolves adiabatically with the movable mirror. So the temporal behaviours of the coupled mirrors can be observed by measuring the density of the output cavity fields [68]. In order to observe the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and broken-symmetry behaviours, besides changing the coupling between the two mechanical resonator as shown above, we can also change the optical induced gain (damp) by tuning the amplitude of the driven field from weak to strong enough. As the driven field is weak, the optical induced mechanical gain (damp) is below the threshold of $\mathcal{PT}$ broken, so the system is in the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime. With the enhance of the driven field, the optical induced mechanical gain (damp) will go beyond the critical point of the system, then the system comes to the broken-symmetry regime.

In conclusion, we have theoretically demonstrated that the coupled optomechanical system can be used to observe $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry for mechanical freedom. By tuning the amplitude of the driven fields or the coupling constant between the mechanical resonators, we can observe the transition between the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and broken-symmetry phases. In the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime, the two mirrors become two beat frequency oscillators. While in the broken $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime, the oscillation amplitude of the mirrors increases (or after an initial decreases) exponentially. Most of the parameters used in calculations are within the reach of the current technology, so we hope that our proposal can be realized in the near future. In this paper, quantum fluctuations and thermal excitation are not considered in the derivation. In the following work, we are going to develop a description of mechanical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems by using full quantum theory [58].

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

X.W.X. thank W. Tan, Q. Zheng and Y. Yao for fruitful discussion.

Appendix A: Adiabatically elimination

From Eqs. (15)-(20), we can derive the dynamic equations for the coupled mechanical resonators by adiabatically eliminating the cavity modes. As $q_i = (b_i^\dagger + b_i)/\sqrt{2}$, Eqs. (15) and (16) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt}a_1 = -\left(\frac{\kappa_1}{2} + i\Delta_1'\right)a_1 + i\frac{G_1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(b_1^\dagger + b_1\right), \quad \text{(A1)}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}a_2 = -\left(\frac{\kappa_2}{2} + i\Delta_2'\right)a_2 + i\frac{G_2}{\sqrt{2}}\left(b_2^\dagger + b_2\right). \quad \text{(A2)}$$

In order to observe $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in the coupled movable mirrors, we need to provide gain to the left movable mirror and equivalent damp to the right movable mirror respectively. Therefore, we assume that the driven field to the left cavity is resonant to the blue sideband ($\Delta_1' = -\omega_1$) and the driven field to the right cavity is resonant to the red sideband ($\Delta_2' = \omega_2$). After introducing the slowly vary amplitudes: $\widetilde{a}_1 = a_1 e^{\left(\frac{\kappa_1}{2} - i\omega_1\right)t}$, $\widetilde{a}_2 = a_2 e^{\left(\frac{\kappa_2}{2} + i\omega_2\right)t}$, $\widetilde{b}_1 = b_1 e^{i\omega_1 t}$, $\widetilde{b}_2 = b_2 e^{i\omega_2 t}$, and integrating Eqs. (A1) and (A2), we get

$$\widetilde{a}_1 = \int_{-\infty}^{t} i\frac{G_1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\widetilde{b}_1^\dagger + \widetilde{b}_1 e^{-i2\omega_1\tau}\right)e^{\frac{\kappa_1}{2}\tau}d\tau, \quad \text{(A3)}$$

$$\widetilde{a}_2 = \int_{-\infty}^{t} i\frac{G_2}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\widetilde{b}_2 + \widetilde{b}_2^\dagger e^{i2\omega_2\tau}\right)e^{\frac{\kappa_2}{2}\tau}d\tau. \quad \text{(A4)}$$

Under the assumption that the cavities dynamic much faster than the effective optomechanical coupling $\kappa_i \gg G_i$, we can adiabatically eliminate the cavity modes. As $\kappa_i \gg \gamma_i$, $\widetilde{b}_i$ dynamic much slowly than $\widetilde{a}_i$, so that we can take $\widetilde{b}_i$ out of the integral and evaluate the integrals, then we find the approximate expressions of the cavity modes [60],

$$a_1 = i\frac{\sqrt{2}G_1}{\kappa_1}b_1^\dagger + i\frac{\sqrt{2}G_1}{(\kappa_1 - i4\omega_1)}b_1, \quad \text{(A5)}$$

$$a_2 = i\frac{\sqrt{2}G_2}{\kappa_2}b_2 + i\frac{\sqrt{2}G_2}{(\kappa_2 + i4\omega_2)}b_2^\dagger. \quad \text{(A6)}$$

Substituting these expressions into Eqs. (19) and (20), then we find Eqs. (21) and (22).

Appendix B: Bi-orthogonal basis approach

We are going to solve Eqs. (31) analytically by the bi-orthogonal basis approach [61–63]. In order to write these solutions in an explicit form, we use the engenstates

$$|1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\0\\0\end{pmatrix}, |2\rangle = \begin{pmatrix}0\\1\\0\\0\end{pmatrix}, |3\rangle = \begin{pmatrix}0\\0\\1\\0\end{pmatrix}, |4\rangle = \begin{pmatrix}0\\0\\0\\1\end{pmatrix}. \quad \text{(B1)}$$

The effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} satisfy the eigenvalue equations

$$H_{\text{eff}}|\phi_i\rangle = \lambda_i|\phi_i\rangle, \quad \text{(B2)}$$

$$H_{\text{eff}}^\dagger|\varphi_i\rangle = \lambda_i^*|\varphi_i\rangle, \quad \text{(B3)}$$

where $|\phi_i\rangle$ and $|\varphi_i\rangle$ are called the bi-orthogonal basis, and they satisfy the bi-orthogonal relations

$$\langle\varphi_i|\phi_j\rangle = D_i\delta_{ij}, \quad \text{(B4)}$$

and generalized completeness relations

$$\sum_i \frac{|\phi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle} = \sum_i \frac{|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|}{\langle\phi_i|\varphi_i\rangle} = 1. \quad \text{(B5)}$$

So we have the basis transform relations

$$|n\rangle = \sum_i \frac{\langle\varphi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle}|\phi_i\rangle = \sum_i \frac{\langle\phi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\phi_i|\varphi_i\rangle}|\varphi_i\rangle, \quad \text{(B6)}$$

with

$$X_{n,i} = \langle n|\phi_i\rangle\,, Y_{n,i} = \langle n|\varphi_i\rangle\,, \tag{B7}$$

and

$$X_i = \left[\frac{J}{\lambda_i}\chi_i, -i\frac{J}{\omega_m}\chi_i, i\frac{\omega_m}{\lambda_i}, 1\right]^T, \tag{B8}$$

$$Y_i = \left[-i\frac{J}{\lambda_i^*} - \frac{J}{\lambda_i^*}\chi_i^*, i\frac{J}{\omega_m}\chi_i^*, i\frac{\omega_m}{\lambda_i^*} + \frac{J^2}{\omega_m\lambda_i^*}\chi_i^*, 1\right]^T. \tag{B9}$$

In terms of the biorthonormal basis $\{|\phi_i\rangle, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$, the initial state is given as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(0)\rangle &= \sum_n c_n |n\rangle \\ &= \sum_i \sum_n \frac{c_n \langle\varphi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle}|\phi_i\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{B10}$$

where the initial conditions are: $c_1 = q_1(0)$, $c_2 = p_1(0)$, $c_3 = q_2(0)$ and $c_4 = p_2(0)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t)\rangle &= e^{-iH_{\rm eff}t}|\Psi(0)\rangle \\ &= \sum_i \sum_n \frac{c_n\langle\varphi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle} e^{-i\lambda_i t}|\phi_i\rangle \\ &= \sum_k \sum_n \sum_i c_n \frac{\langle k|\phi_i\rangle\, e^{-i\lambda_i t}\langle\varphi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle}|k\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{B11}$$

The dynamics of the oscillators are given as

$$q_1(t) = \sum_n \sum_i c_n \frac{\langle 1|\phi_i\rangle\, e^{-i\lambda_i t}\langle\varphi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle}, \tag{B12}$$

$$q_2(t) = \sum_n \sum_i c_n \frac{\langle 3|\phi_i\rangle\, e^{-i\lambda_i t}\langle\varphi_i|n\rangle}{\langle\varphi_i|\phi_i\rangle}. \tag{B13}$$

[1] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5243 (1998).
[2] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 270401 (2002).
[3] T. Kottos, Nat. Phys. **6**, 166 (2010).
[4] C. M. Bender, Rep. Prog. Phys. **70**, 947 (2007).
[5] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, D. N. Christodoulides, and Z. H. Musslimani, Opt. Lett. **32**, 2632 (2007).
[6] K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 103904 (2008).
[7] X. B. Luo, J. H. Huang, H. H. Zhong, X. Z. Qin, Q. T. Xie, Y. S. Kivshar, and C. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 243902 (2013).
[8] C. E. Ruter, K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, D. N. Christodoulides, M. Segev, and D. Kip, Nat. Phys. **6**, 192 (2010).
[9] A. Szameit, M. C. Rechtsman, O. Bahat-Treidel, and M. Segev, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 021806(R) (2011).
[10] A. Regensburger, C. Bersch, M.-A. Miri, G. Onishchukov, D. N. Christodoulides, and U. Peschel, Nature (London) **488**, 167 (2012).
[11] S. Bittner, B. Dietz, U. Günther, H. L. Harney, M. Miski-Oglu, A. Richter, and F. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 024101 (2012).
[12] L. Feng, M. Ayache, J. Q. Huang, Y. L. Xu, M. H. Lu, Y. F. Chen, Y. Fainman, and A. Scherer, Science **333**, 729 (2011).
[13] A. Guo, G. J. Salamo, D. Duchesne, R. Morandotti, M. Volatier-Ravat, V. Aimez, G. A. Siviloglou, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 093902 (2009).
[14] Z. Lin, H. Ramezani, T. Eichelkraut, T. Kottos, H. Cao, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 213901 (2011).
[15] J. Schindler, A. Li, M. C. Zheng, F. M. Ellis, and T. Kottos, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 040101(R) (2011).
[16] Z. Lin, J. Schindler, F. M. Ellis, and T. Kottos, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 050101(R) (2012).
[17] C. M. Bender, B. K. Berntson, D. Parker, and E. Samuel, Am. J. Phys. **81**, 173 (2013).
[18] T. J. Kippenberg and K. J. Vahala, Science **321**, 1172 (2008).
[19] F. Marquardt and S. M. Girvin, Physics **2**, 40 (2009).
[20] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, arXiv:1303.0733 (2013).
[21] S. Gigan, H. R. Böhm, M. Paternostro, F. Blaser, G. Langer, J. B. Hertzberg, K. C. Schwab, D. Bäuerle, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) **444**, 67 (2006).
[22] O. Arcizet, P. F. Cohadon, T. Briant, M. Pinard, and A. Heidmann, Nature (London) **444**, 71 (2006).
[23] A. Schliesser, P. Del'Haye, N. Nooshi, K. J. Vahala, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 243905 (2006).
[24] I. Wilson-Rae, N. Nooshi, W. Zwerger, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 093901 (2007).
[25] F. Marquardt, J. P. Chen, A. A. Clerk, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 093902 (2007).
[26] J. D. Teufel, J. W. Harlow, C. A. Regal, and K. W. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 197203 (2008).
[27] J. D. Thompson, B. M. Zwickl, A. M. Jayich, F. Marquardt, S. M. Girvin, and J. G. E. Harris, Nature (London) **452**, 72 (2008).
[28] A. Schliesser, R. Rivière, G. Anetsberger, O. Arcizet, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Phys. **4**, 415 (2008).
[29] S. Gröblacher, J. B. Hertzberg, M. R. Vanner, G. D. Cole, S. Gigan, K. C. Schwab, and M. Aspelmeyer, Nat. Phys. **5**, 485 (2009).
[30] T. Rocheleau, T. Ndukum, C. Macklin, J. B. Hertzberg, A. A. Clerk, and K. C. Schwab, Nature (London) **463**, 72 (2010).
[31] Y. S. Park and H. Wang, Nat. Phys. **5**, 489 (2009).
[32] A. Schliesser, O. Arcizet, R. Rivière, G. Anetsberger, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Phys. **5**, 509 (2009).
[33] J. D. Teufel, T. Donner, D. Li, J. W. Harlow, M. S. Allman, K. Cicak, A. J. Sirois, J. D. Whittaker, K. W. Lehnert, and R. W. Simmonds, Nature (London) **475**, 359 (2011).
[34] J. Chan, T. P. M. Alegre, A. H. Safavi-Naeini, J. T. Hill, A. Krause, S. Gröblacher, M. Aspelmeyer, and O. Painter, Nature (London) **478**, 89 (2011).
[35] E. Verhagen, S. Deléglise, S. Weis, A. Schliesser, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nature (London) **482**, 63 (2012).
[36] Y. Li, Y. D. Wang, F. Xue, and C. Bruder, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 134301 (2008).
[37] J. Q. Liao and C. K. Law, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 053838 (2011).
[38] W. J. Nie, Y. H. Lan, Y. Li, and S. Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 063849 (2013).
[39] V. B. Braginsky, S. E. Strigin, and S. P. Vyatchanin, Phys. Lett.

A **287**, 331 (2001).
[40] W. Kells and E. DAmbrosio, Phys. Lett. A **299**, 326 (2002).
[41] V. B. Braginsky, S. E. Strigin, and S. P. Vyatchanin, Phys. Lett. A **305**, 111 (2002).
[42] D. A. Rodrigues and A. D. Armour, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 053601 (2010).
[43] A. D. Armour and D. A. Rodrigues, C. R. Physique **13**, 440 (2012).
[44] P. D. Nation, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 053828 (2013).
[45] N. Lörch, J. Qian, A. Clerk, F. Marquardt, and K. Hammerer, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011015 (2014).
[46] M. Poot, K. Y. Fong, M. Bagheri, W. H. P. Pernice, and H. X. Tang, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 053826 (2012).
[47] F. Marquardt, J. G. E. Harris, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 103901 (2006).
[48] M. Ludwig, B. Kubala, and F. Marquardt, New J. Phys. **10**, 095013 (2008).
[49] J. Qian, A. A. Clerk, K. Hammerer, and F. Marquardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 253601 (2012).
[50] H. Z. Wu, G. Heinrich, and F. Marquardt, New J. Phys. **15** 123022 (2013).
[51] H. Rokhsari, T. J. Kippenberg, T. Carmon, and K. J. Vahala, Opt. Exp. **13**, 5293 (2005).
[52] T. J. Kippenberg, H. Rokhsari, T. Carmon, A. Scherer, and K. J. Vahala, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 033901 (2005).
[53] C. Metzger, M. Ludwig, C. Neuenhahn, A. Ortlieb, I. Favero, K. Karrai, and F. Marquardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 133903 (2008).
[54] G. Anetsberger, O. Arcizet, Q. P. Unterreithmeier, R. Rivière, A. Schliesser, E. M. Weig, J. P. Kotthaus, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Phys. **5**, 909 (2009).
[55] I. S. Grudinin, H. Lee, O. Painter, and K. J. Vahala, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 083901 (2010).
[56] J. B. Khurgin, M. W. Pruessner, T. H. Stievater, and W. S. Rabinovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 223904 (2012).
[57] J. B. Khurgin, M. W. Pruessner, T. H. Stievater, and W. S. Rabinovich, New J. Phys. **14**, 105022 (2012).
[58] G. S. Agarwal and K. N. Qu, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 031802(R) (2012).
[59] T. Kumar, A. B. Bhattacherjee, and ManMohan, Opt. Commun. **285**, 300 (2012).
[60] K. Jähne, C. Genes, K. Hammerer, M. Wallquist, E. S. Polzik, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 063819 (2009).
[61] J. Wong, J. Math. Phys. **8**, 2039 (1967).
[62] C. P. Sun, Phys. Scr. **48**, 393 (1993).
[63] P. T. Leung, W. M. Suen, C. P. Sun, and K. Young, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 6101 (1998).
[64] M. Eichenfield, R. Camacho, J. Chan, K. J. Vahala, and O. Painter, Nature (London) **459**, 550 (2009).
[65] Q. Lin, J. Rosenberg, X. S. Jiang, K. J. Vahala, and O. Painter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 103601 (2009).
[66] Q. Lin, J. Rosenberg, D. Chang, R. Camacho, M. Eichenfield, K. J. Vahala, and O. Painter, Nat. Photon. **4**, 236 (2010).
[67] G. S. Wiederhecker, L. Chen, A. Gondarenko, and M. Lipson, Nature (London) **462**, 633 (2009).
[68] T. Carmon, H. Rokhsari, L. Yang, T. J. Kippenberg, and K. J. Vahala, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 223902 (2005).